

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/236,552

Applicant(s)

TOMIDA, WATARU

Examiner

Joseph R. Pokrzywa

Art Unit

2622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph R. Pokrzywa.(3) Richard J. Kim.(2) Madeline Nguyen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 May 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 14, 17, 18, 21Identification of prior art discussed: Ho et al (U.S. PAT # 5,805,298) & FOLADARE et al. (U.S. PAT. 5,978,837)Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Joseph R. Pokrzywa 5/8/02
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed ways that the invention differs from the cited prior art. The examiner agrees with applicant in that there are differences. However, the claims 14 & 21 of the invention can be interpreted as being anticipated by Ho and Foladore.